



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/561,383

11/26/2007

Stefan Gustavsson

9564-5

6472

54414 7590 05/18/2010
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.
P.O. BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/18/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/561,383	Applicant(s) GUSTAVSSON, STEFAN	
	Examiner MICHAEL N. OPSASNICK	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakisaka et al (5917944) in further view of Mahieux et al (5848170).

As per claims 1,16,17 Wakisaka et al (5917944) teaches a device detecting voice activity using multiple microphones and generating a signal in response to sounds/speech (Fig. 8, subblocks 802,803; col. 12 lines 31-45; Wakisaka teaches the use of multiple multi-directional microphones wherein the number of microphones used is not limited); as processing the signals for a particular desired voice (col. 12 lines 33-35) and for background noise (col. 12 lines 35-38); Wakisaka et al (5917944) implies directionality and associated cone of detection (well known in the art of directional microphones), but does not detail the exact microphonic setup, however, Mahieux et al (5848170) teaches a microphonic array with a display (Fig. 2b, 3a). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of microphone related displays at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Wakisaka et al (5917944) with a

Art Unit: 2626

coplanar microphone array because it would advantageously improve upon the sensing ability into a display monitor (Mahieux et al (5848170), col. 2 line 53- col. 3 line 55).

As per claims 2-11, the combination of Wakisaka et al (5917944) in view of Mahieux et al (5848170) teaches a microphone array (3 or more microphones, Mahieux, Fig. 2b,3a) with directionality pointed to sounds (Wakisaka, col. 12 lines 33-38), defining a cone angle (Mahieux, col. 7 lines 5-61; with the calculated cone angle being 25 degrees +/-, as well as 80 degree angle - col. 5 lines 46-67).

As per claims 12-15,18,19, the combination of Wakisaka et al (5917944) in view of Mahieux et al (5848170) teaches a handheld device. (Wakisaka et al (5917944), Fig. 6b, 6a; col. 10 lines 66 –67; col. 15 lines 10-24), with microphones on the edges (Fig. 2b,3a).

Claims 20-23,25,26 are method claims that contain steps that are performed by the apparatus as detailed in claims 1-11 above; therefore the claim scope of claims 20-23,25,26 are similar in scope and content of claims 1-11 and as such, claims 20-23,25,26 are rejected under similar rationale as presented against claims 1-11 above.

As per claim 24, the combination of Wakisaka et al (5917944) in view of Mahieux et al (5848170) teaches the directional sound source dependent upon sound speed, distance d (Mahieux - col. 7 lines 5-50).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 2/17/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As per applicants arguments that the Wakisaka reference does not teach distinguishment of speech versus non-speech based upon directionality, examiner disagrees and notes that in the previously mentioned background/speech processing of Wakisaka, Wakisaka further explains in col. 17 lines 22-37 that a dedicated mutlidirectional microphone is used to process sounds that is "other than the target voice" and a directional microphone to process the target voice (in other words, the directional microphone is used for speech recognition, and the multidirectional microphone is used to process other sounds (and not speech recognition)), and hence, Wakisaka meets the current claim scope.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2626

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Richemond Dorvil, can be reached at (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael N. Opsasnick/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626
05/16/2010